

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 163 399

CS 004 471

AUTHOR Sherman, Richard H.
TITLE Sequential Aspects of Silent and Oral Reading.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the College Reading Association (22nd, Washington, D.C., October 19-21, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Elementary Education; Literature Reviews; *Oral Reading; Reading Comprehension; *Reading Instruction; Reading Rate; *Reading Research; *Sequential Approach; *Silent Reading; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

The commonly-used instructional sequence in which children read material silently and then read it orally is simply not effective. The arguments presented by E.A. Betts in 1957 for silent before oral reading can be countered point by point. Studies that have compared various reading conditions have had serious limitations and have failed to show whether silent before oral reading facilitates reading comprehension and rate. In fact, oral reading may be used for three purposes--diagnosis, information gain, and communication with others--and a classification scheme can be devised that separates oral reading into manageable teaching units. In a study of aspects of silent and oral reading, 180 pupils in grades two, four, and six were assigned to six conditions: silent-oral-test, oral-silent-test, silent-silent-test, oral-oral-test, silent-test-oral, and oral-test-silent. The conditions were evaluated in terms of comprehension and reading rate. Among the major conclusions were that there were no advantages among any multiple reading condition for comprehension, indicating that all multiple conditions work equally well and that there is no need to stress the silent-oral condition. (Tables of study results and the classification scheme for oral reading are included.) (GW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED163399

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Sequential Aspects of Silent and Oral Reading

Dr. Richard H. Sherman
Assistant Professor of Education
Reading and Learning Disabilities Center
State University College at Potsdam
Potsdam, New York 13676

Paper presented at the College Reading Association Meeting
Washington, D. C. October, 19, 1978

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard H. Sherman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

⑤ Richard H. Sherman, 1978

CS884 #71

Sequential Aspects of Silent and Oral Reading

By

Dr. Richard H. Sherman
Reading and Learning Disabilities Center
State University College at Potsdam
Potsdam, New York 13676

Introductory Overview

A sequence within an activity for reading instruction continues to be the general practice in many diverse classrooms. This sequence finds its way into the instructional pattern at one stage or another whether or not directions in teacher's manuals suggest that the teacher use this practice. The instructional format as suggested and practiced is to have children pre-read material silently prior to reading that same material orally. As a classroom teacher grades Kindergarten through High School, this researcher found that the specific aspect of the so-called silent versus oral reading controversy simply was not effective. It was not effective because youngsters who had previously been taught to decode orally (sounding-out) were now being asked to decode silently and to do so in an effort to read orally. They could not successfully manage this change of procedural order. Some students just did not read anything during the first silent reading because they hadn't had sufficient instruction in independent silent reading. In addition, there were some students who did read silently, but what they read was either incorrect or could not be transformed from the silent reading back to the oral reading successfully. These three points among others prompted this teacher to become a researcher and inquire as to the foundation for the nature of the sequence.

The inquiry led through several teacher's manuals, reading textbooks, and ultimately through countless research studies. While the silent versus

oral reading controversy continues to be of interest, this researcher has come to question whether or not there is a controversy or merely a pseudo-controversy (Sherman, 1978). This presentation will confine itself to that small segment concerned only with the sequential aspects of the so-called "silent versus oral reading controversy."

Historical and Experimental Studies as Background

Vague reference to the sequential aspects of silent and oral reading has been hinted at in many reading texts particularly after World War I when silent reading instruction became sharply emphasized. Few early references dealt with the suggestion directly. However, Betts (1957) presented a discussion advocating silent before oral that is predicated on four main points. This researcher did not presume to match the Betts' depth of experience at the time he authored his book, neither situation for situation nor year for year. However, the present researcher had discovered the three points mentioned earlier based on fourteen years of his own experience as a classroom teacher, reading teacher, reading coordinator, clinical assistant, and college instructor of reading. Betts' four points are presented here immediately followed by this researcher's counter points:

1. Silent reading should precede oral reading so that each child can gain a measure of independence in terms of pace within the reading group; but, this independence is in reality a feature of classroom management rather than part of the learning process.

2. Silent reading should precede oral reading so that a reader can identify word and comprehension difficulties; but, this suggestion can be challenged by noting the fre-

quency of incidents where young readers ignore and skip over areas of difficulty in their reading.

3. Silent reading should precede oral reading because the oral re-reading will be improved by first having overcome word recognition and comprehension difficulties; but, many readers can decode and even read fluently in oral reading with little ability to comprehend the material read.

4. Silent reading should precede oral reading so that the reader is given an opportunity to make maximum use of word recognition skills, especially context; but, in many instances word recognition skills were taught orally in some sounding out method and continued to be oral and not silent.

In essence, the foundation for what has become a traditional reading condition of silent before oral reading has been based more on conventional wisdom than on controlled investigations.

Recent editions of reading texts similarly espoused the silent before oral reading condition (Bamman et al., 1973; Harris, 1970; Spache & Spache, 1973), but did so with less explanation and without references to resources upon which to base their suggestions. (While revised editions of texts have been since published, teachers still use the older editions).

Several reasearch oriented studies in one manner or another considered the testing features of silent versus oral reading. However, most of these studies sought to control for sequence using counterbalanced designs. A few direct studies of the sequential aspects of silent and oral reading supported the traditional silent before oral (SOT) condition (Kirby, 1934;

Myresko, 1966). Basically, they presented sketchy accounts of a loosely controlled field study and failed to include specific data in terms of selection of subjects, randomization, and other important procedures. Unless substantial data could have been provided, these studies as they stand could not be seriously considered as strong support for the traditional condition. Even more tenuous was an often-cited essay based on limited empirical experience which advocated the SOT condition (Karp, 1943).

Most prevalent in early, and indeed in most, studies were those which compared the singularity of reading conditions such as silent alone (ST) versus oral alone (OT). Found within this group were some studies that used ST versus OT conditions where all subjects encountered the same materials and read in both conditions (Rogers, 1937). Other studies had subjects encounter the same materials, but with varying conditions (Jones, 1932), or with alternate conditions (Foulton & Brown, 1967). Other studies varied both materials and conditions (Harrelson, 1923; Morris, 1970). One study added a third condition, listening (LT) (Swalm, 1972).

The OT condition was also known as the oral-at-sight condition and often used in diagnostic testing. Kasdon (1973), in a study designed to examine some assumptions of the oral-at-sight condition for diagnostic purposes, compared the OT condition with the traditional SOT condition. This procedure represented an imbalance in that the subjects

read material once in the OT condition and twice in the SOT condition and it may well have been the second re-reading phase that became the source for the significance found in the study. The same procedural question may be raised for three similar studies (Kasdon, 1967, 1970; Waynant, 1972).

One of the most recently reported studies in this area (Brecht, 1977) investigated testing format and instructional level with an Informal Reading Inventory. In the study performance of second, third, and fourth graders compared in essence the imbalanced design of OT vs. OOT using two forms of an unpublished IRI. The significance of this study is not in the researcher's findings, but that after only studying OT vs. OOT, he concluded "that to get the best measure of a child's instructional reading level, we must allow him or her to read the selection silently first, especially so long as we use placement criterion levels based on that technique." He then sets himself along side of Betts, Spache, and others in his findings. It may be recalled that these sources never formally referred to any research studies of their own in this area. Although this article was a report of an experimental study, few if any research articles were included, primarily because the author claimed they were non-existent. It would seem that unless a study dealt with all aspects of a current research project, one could easily dismiss any other research that dealt with a single or several side aspects. Studies were indeed conducted with the IRI and other tests. But, the point must be reiterated: as reported, this was not a study of the traditional SOT condition even though the final conclusion would lead one to believe it had been just that.

A recent attempt to study the OT, SOT, and ST conditions contained both an imbalance and a procedural discrepancy in that the subjects in the

OT and SOT conditions were given examiner assistance where necessary in the conditions where there was oral reading prior to testing. No assistance was given in the silent-only condition. The amount of variance which this examiner assistance contributed to the overall effect was not determined (Gleim, 1971).

In an earlier study, Jones (1932) used a counterbalanced design of test forms and reading conditions with children from schools with diverse population sizes in grades three, five, and seven. With twenty pupils per grade or a total of three hundred pupils, she found diverse results favoring either the silent or oral reading by grade as well as in schools of differing size populations. She found that comprehension in silent or oral reading varied with the individual with a greater number of subjects comprehending better silently than they did orally. However, the majority of pupils made the same score on both types of reading. Jones considered the sequence aspect by controlling for it with two different single readings rather than having pupils read the same material in both silent and oral ways.

Rowell (1975), in a somewhat similar study investigated high and low socio-economically designated schools in grades three and five in rural, suburban, and urban schools. In effect, she studied the SOT versus OST conditions. Among her statistically significant findings was that the practice effect of a second reading did aid her subjects' performance. That is, the second reading in each condition was significantly better than the first reading. However, the significant findings for group means favored silent reading over oral reading. Although statistically significant, there was in reality only a 0.34 difference between the mean scores. This is not even a difference of a

half year and not of real practical difference.

In short, the sequential aspect of the silent versus oral reading controversy had not been adequately studied. Whether silent before oral reading facilitates reading comprehension and rate of reading has as yet to be determined because several previous investigations have had serious limitations: some contained procedural imbalances in that different conditions required one reading while others required two readings; some were confined to an age level that may well have been beyond meaningful applications; some limited application by being confined to a single grade; some ignored sequential aspects while others used a counter-balanced design to control for sequence; and no studies dealt with all possible testing conditions.

Types of Oral Reading

In many instances, researchers have talked about oral reading as if all phases of oral reading were the same. If one were to lump all of oral reading together, it is doubtful that the controversy could ever be resolved within oral reading let alone in relationship to silent reading. However, if we were to consider several types of oral reading and then look at the textbooks and research reports, we might find that several contestants are really arguing the same view and several others who feel they are in agreement really aren't even close in viewpoint. If, on the other hand, we consider such distinctions as oral-at-sight reading for diagnostic purposes, oral reading for information gain on the part of the reader for the reader, and oral reading for communicating information and enjoyment to others, a utilitarian classification scheme can be devised. The scheme can not only allow for discussion,

but clearly separates oral reading into manageable teaching units. The classification scheme presented here does not seek to break oral reading into a taxonomic microcosm as has been done in skills centered models of reading instruction. When one breaks down aspects of the reading process into very fine bits, the instructional practitioners adopt it and we begin to find pupils learning skill number 24 for the sole purpose of getting on to skill number 25. All too quickly forgotten is that what everyone is about involves the whole process of learning to read.

If oral-at-sight reading is reserved for diagnosis and some other very special instances and at the same time help students to move from oral decoding to silent reading for meaning (that is, not reading for information gain on the part of the reader), then we can get onto the fun part of oral reading where we communicate information and enjoyment to others. In my reading groups I always had the children prepare (decode and derive meaning) by rehearsing in the several corners of the classroom. This they did individually getting my assistance privately where needed. Then instead of round robin reading where children's oral performance is usually based on their first reading, we had an oral expression demonstration where everyone rehearsed sufficiently to present their best oral reading. We also had no audience discipline problems as well.

This classification scheme for oral reading could be considered merely an interesting exercise where mature and successful readers are concerned. Successful and mature readers by and large are adept at handling the three types of oral reading virtually at sight. This may not be necessarily true for average and younger readers. The classifications take on significant importance where corrective, remedial, and clinical readers are considered. These individuals can not read

material at sight and successfully decode, interpret, and adequately communicate material simultaneously. Researchers and teachers, therefore, must be more aware of several types of oral reading. (A rough outline on the Types of Oral Reading follows the conclusion of this paper).

Sequential and Multiple Aspects

The following abstract related to a recent study which investigated sequential, multiple, and repeated aspects of silent and oral reading comprehension and rate (Sherman, 1977).

The purpose of this study was to find out the effect of testing reading under six conditions on comprehension and silent and oral reading rates. The conditions were: silent-oral-test (SOT), oral-silent-test (OST), silent-silent-test (SST), oral-oral-test (OOT), silent-test-oral (STO), and oral-test-silent (OTS).

By means of stratified random sampling, 180 pupils from an inner-city school in grades II, IV, and VI were assigned to one of six conditions. This resulted in ten pupils assigned to each condition per grade level. The instrument used was the Gilmore Oral Reading Test, Forms C and D (1968). The reading conditions were evaluated in terms of comprehension, silent, and oral reading rates. Analysis of covariance for each of the three criteria was followed by a posteriori Scheffé's ($p < .05$).

Results

Comprehension

There was a statistically significant condition effect ($p = .029$) for comprehension. Specifically, significant differences occurred at grade two SOT having a greater adjusted mean score than STO, at grade four all other conditions yielded greater adjusted mean scores than STO, and at grade six, SOT, OST, and OOT all yielded greater adjusted mean scores than OTS. As can be noted, there were no significant differences among any of the multiple or sequential conditions (SOT, OST, SST, or OOT), but rather various multiple and sequential conditions yielded greater mean scores than did the single conditions STO or OTS (cf. Tables 5 and 6).

Rate

For the combined adjusted mean rate scores for silent and oral reading, there was a significant condition effect ($p = .002$). Specifically, at grade two SST yielded greater mean rate scores than did OOT, SOT, and OTS -or, two silent readings yielded the greatest mean rate scores; for grade four, SST yielded greater mean rate scores than did OOT, SOT, and STO; and, for grade six, there were no statistically significant differences (cf. Tables 31 and 32).

The most important preliminary conclusions for these first two series of analyses was that there was no significant advantage among the multiple sequential or multiple repeated readings for comprehension and therefore no justification for continuing to have pupils read silently before they read orally. Neither was the SOT condition significantly superior with regard to rate. The SST condition may have yielded faster mean scores, but did not correspond similarly for comprehension. Rate without comprehension is a ridiculous exercise.

Repeated Effects

The repeated condition STOT, OST, and OOT were also analyzed by means of correlated t -tests.

Comprehension

Comprehension gain through multiple readings and testing in STOT and OTST conditions had been studied before and was not originally scheduled as a condition in the present investigation. However, the pilot study revealed pupils' reticence to attend to the task for the second silent reading after being tested for comprehension. The condition was to have been OT or a single oral reading. It was thought that to complete the paradigm silent reading rate should also be recorded and thus the condition became OTS (and the other corresponding single condition became STO). One could easily monitor the second reading after the test in the STO condition, but pupils perceived that they didn't need to really read ~~in~~ OTS second time since no further comprehension questions would be asked. They therefore recorded astronomically rapid reading rate scores for silent reading. The second test in OTST was used only to keep that second silent reading honest. Subsequently, the data was analyzed and yielded an overall significance ($t = .001$) with specific significance found in the fourth grade ($t = .001$) and in the sixth grade ($t = .005$). For the groups in fourth and sixth grade, multiple readings and tests seemed to improve with practice (cf. Table 15).

Silent Reading Rate

For silent reading rate in condition SST, there was an overall significant difference favoring the second reading ($t = .001$) and significant differences at grade two ($t = .05$), at grade four ($t = .01$), and at grade six ($t = .005$) (cf. Table 16). It would seem that an initial first silent reading led to a faster re-reading rate at all grades tested.

Oral Reading Rate

For oral reading rate in the condition OOT there was a significant result overall and for each grade level ($t = .002$) (cf. Table 17). This would seem to indicate that an oral pre-reading is the most effective type for oral re-reading. This finding is more or less consistent with the findings of Brecht (1977) as well as with Gonzales and Elijah (1975) who all studied OT versus OOT. When one considers that there was little significance for the SOT and OST multiple and sequential conditions for rate and a good deal of significance for second readings in multiple repeated readings, one could almost take the liberty of going out on a limb to formulate a conclusion. However, since different analyses were used and the combined results of repeated readings were no more significantly greater than the sequential readings, it would be more prudent to be content at this time to look out at the limb longingly rather than attempting to traverse that limb and state the obvious conclusion. Moreover, this researcher seriously questions the stress of rate of oral reading. The appropriate instructional stress ought to be more concerned with fluent reading rather than merely how fast an individual can say the words. The appropriate instructional stress for increasing rate in conjunction with comprehension might better be placed with regard to silent reading.

Conclusions

There were no advantages among any multiple reading conditions for comprehension. Multiple readings had significance greater than for single readings for nearly half of all comparisons for comprehension. Two silent readings provided an advantage over other multiple readings at grades two or four with no significant differences among the other multiple conditions.

Increased silent reading rate did not correspond with increased comprehension scores. For the most part, repeated measures for testing comprehension and rate were significantly greater for the second scores and rates than for the first ones.

Implications

The most important implications included that any multiple condition works equally well and there is no need to stress the SOT condition. Children should be encouraged to read both silently and orally throughout the day in their reading instruction, but not necessarily the same material in a silent-oral sequence. Serious thought should be given to diagnoses based on single readings as it does not reflect the optimum pupil performance for reading comprehension and rate. On-going evaluation through the course of instruction may reveal a developmental improvement, but still records progress on something less than optimum performance. It is best to provide a practice reading in the same way in which a pupil is to perform to obtain a better performance for comprehension and rate. In oral reading particularly, subsequent readings tend to increase fluency. On the other hand, from personal experience most of us must be aware of our attempts to rehearse silently and then perform orally. The results at best are interesting and at worst a disaster. The exceptions are those individuals who have trained to perform with "cold" oral-at-sight readings. For the most part, included in this group would be newscasters, some actors, and teachers when reading notices to class, but particularly when reading stories to children. Very often in these situations an additional process, editing at sight, becomes necessary.

STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE AT POTSDAM
READING AND LEARNING DISABILITIES CENTER

Dr. Richard H. Sherman

Types of Oral Reading

Type I Reading for Decoding

This is an oral-at-sight reading often used for Diagnosing Accuracy and listing oral reading errors such as omissions, substitutions, insertions, reversals, hesitations (fluency), repetitions and the like.

- A. Association of spoken and written elements as a concept
 - 1. Echoic reading
 - 2. Neurological Impress Method
 - 3. Word attack skills
 - 4. linguistic decoding

Type II Oral reading for Comprehension

This is an oral-at-sight reading whereby the reader is trying to obtain information for himself or herself only. The method is considerably less effective than silent reading for the same purpose particularly beyond the decoding stage or third grade.

- A. Association of oral language with with larger units of written thoughts as a concept
- B. Comprehension
 - 1. Variations of learned information (slight alterations)
 - 2. Entirely new information (or greater alterations in previously encountered material)
- C. Physiology and Mechanics
 - 1. Eye Movments
 - 2. Eye-voice span
 - 3. Voice production (speech mechanisms).
- D. Preparation
 - 1. Silent pre-reading of oral reading (not effective)
 - 2. Oral re-reading (more effective)

Type III Oral Reading for Communication for Self and Others

This can only be accomplished once decoding and meaning have been completed. With the exception of linguistic decoders who can often communicate meaning to others but not to themselves in oral expressive reading, several reading will have to be undertaken to reach this stage. Therefore, only those trained and have need will be able to accomplish all three types in one oral-at-sight or "cold" reading.

- A. Sharing information
- B. Entertainment
- C. Social activities where the content becomes the means for other activities.
- D. Voice production and expressive style

Table 5

Adjusted Mean Comprehension Scores by Condition and Grade

Grade		SOT (n=10)	OST (n=10)	SST (n=10)	OOT (n=10)	STO (n=10)	OTS (n=10)	Σ
II	$\bar{X}$	2.79	2.38	2.37	2.38	0.74	1.65	2.05
	<u>SD</u>	1.42	1.06	1.30	0.94	0.48	1.07	1.24
IV	$\bar{X}$	4.71	5.12	4.47	5.00	2.48	5.01	4.47
	<u>SD</u>	2.14	2.82	2.12	2.30	2.25	2.24	2.41
VI	$\bar{X}$	7.12	7.18	5.71	7.24	5.67	4.00	6.10
	<u>SD</u>	2.58	2.47	2.40	2.35	2.04	1.54	2.40
Σ	$\bar{X}$	4.87	4.89	4.18	4.87	2.96	3.55	4.22
	<u>SD</u>	2.71	2.95	2.39	2.78	2.69	2.17	2.70

Table 6

ANACOVA for GORT Comprehension

Source of Variation	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Main Effects	722.875	11	65.716	65.716	.001
Condition	29.298	5	5.860	2.571	.029*
Grade	3.077	2	1.538	0.675	.999
Sex	0.380	1	0.380	0.167	.999
Age (Covar)	0.420	1	0.420	0.184	.999
NYC (Covar)	102.801	1	102.801	45.098	.001
NYV (Covar)	31.099	1	31.099	13.643	.001
Interactions					
Condition x Grade	41.639	10	4.164	1.827	.061
Condition x Sex	6.979	5	1.396	0.612	.999
Grade x Condition	3.482	2	1.741	0.764	.999
Condition x Grade x Sex	13.733	9	1.526	0.669	.999
Explained		37	21.195		
Residual		142	2.280		
Total		179	6.190		

Table 31

Adjusted Mean Rate Scores of Two Readings by Condition and Grade

Grade		SOT (n=10)	OST (n=10)	SST (n=10)	OOT (n=10)	STO (n=10)	OTS (n=10)	
II	$\bar{X}$	37.66	66.92	106.84	35.98	76.34	25.45	62.05
	<u>SD</u>	17.17	32.29	50.73	23.13	31.47	25.45	39.42
IV	$\bar{X}$	115.09	162.20	195.57	100.21	129.67	152.17	142.49
	<u>SD</u>	48.48	50.49	58.82	33.77	15.10	31.82	51.53
VI	$\bar{X}$	129.54	171.25	179.47	138.26	168.97	157.37	160.81
	<u>SD</u>	20.84	42.48	79.95	24.80	33.28	33.67	47.22
	$\bar{X}$	94.10	140.12	160.63	91.48	124.99	119.36	121.78
	<u>SD</u>	51.37	67.76	73.46	50.46	47.04	58.87	63.03

Table 32

ANACOVA for Combined Silent and Oral Reading Rates in Words Per Minute

Source of Variation	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Main Effects	199844.500	11	18167.680	15.054	.001
Condition	24543.258	5	4908.648	4.067	.002*
Grade	15105.160	2	7552.578	6.258	.003*
Sex	168.624	1	168.624	0.140	.999
Age (Covar)	3497.266	1	3497.266	2.898	.087
NYC (Covar)	2581.142	1	2581.142	2.139	.142
NYV (Covar)	27973.613	1	27973.613	23.179	.001
Interactions					
Condition x Grade	1038.912	2	519.456	0.430	.999
Condition x Sex	7336.082	5	1467.216	1.216	.304
Grade x Condition	6658.297	10	665.830	0.552	.999
Condition x Grade x Sex	12515.348	9	1390.594	1.152	.330
Explained		37	6305.156		
Residual		142	1206.870		
Total		179	2260.707		

Table 15

t Test for Adjusted Mean Scores of First and Second Comprehension Tests in Condition OTST

Variable	Grade	$\bar{X}$	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
Comp 1	2	1.43	1.05	10	0.54	NS
Comp 2		1.32	1.61			
Comp 1	4	4.79	2.25	10	9.32	.001
Comp 2		8.22	2.31			
Comp 1	6	3.80	1.54	10	3.94	.005
Comp 2		4.99	2.05			
Comp 1	Σ	3.35	2.17	30	4.81	.001
Comp 2		4.86	3.42			

Table 20

t Test for Adjusted Mean Scores of First and Second Accuracy Scores in Condition OOT

Variable	Grade	$\bar{X}$	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
AC1	2	2.28	0.98	10	4.60	.005
AC2		2.86	0.90			
AC1	4	5.60	1.98	10	2.91	.025
AC2		6.27	1.96			
AC1	6	3.85	1.25	10	3.01	.025
AC2		4.32	1.40			
AC1	Σ	3.91	1.98	30	5.76	.001
AC2		4.48	2.02			

Table 16

t Test for Adjusted Mean Scores of First and Second
Silent Reading Rate in Condition SST

Variable	Grade	$\bar{X}$	SD	n	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
Silent 1	2	69.05	49.52	10	2.36	.05
Silent 2		94.32	58.41			
Silent 1	4	160.65	50.54	10	3.43	.01
Silent 2		203.13	70.37			
Silent 1	6	156.11	70.24	10	3.69	.005
Silent 2		182.33	90.20			
Silent 1	2	128.60	70.14	30	5.29	.001
Silent 2		159.93	86.09			

Table 17

t Test for Adjusted Mean Scores of First and Second
Oral Reading Rate in Condition OOT

Variable	Grade	$\bar{X}$	SD	n	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
Oral 1	2	39.27	22.87	10	5.40	.001
Oral 2		69.93	26.30			
Oral 1	4	107.20	34.64	10	5.55	.001
Oral 2		128.85	32.91			
Oral 1	6	138.43	22.91	10	8.91	.001
Oral 2		164.41	25.23			
Oral 1	2	94.97	49.70	30	10.43	.001
Oral 2		121.06	48.15			

STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE AT POTSDAM
READING AND LEARNING DISABILITIES CENTER

Dr. Richard H. Sherman

Sequential Aspects of Silent and Oral Reading: Selected References

- Bamman, H. A., Dawson, M.A., & McGovern, J. J. Fundamentals of basic reading instruction (3rd ed.). New York: David McKay, 1973.
- Betts, E. A. Foundations of reading instruction. New York: American Book Co., 1957.
- Brecht, R. D. Testing format and instructional level with the informal reading inventory. The Reading Teacher, 1977, 31, 57-59.
- Glenn, H. W. The effect of silent and oral reading on literal comprehension and oral reading performance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1971.
- Gonzales, P.C. & Elijah, D. V. Rereading: effect on error patterns and performance levels on the IRI. The Reading Teacher, 1975, 28, 647-652.
- Harrelson, P. V. The effect of knowledge of results upon oral and silent reading. Peabody Journal of Education, 1923, 1, 78-85.
- Harris, A. J. How to increase reading ability (5th ed.). New York: David McKay, 1970.
- Jones, E. B. A comparison of comprehension results in oral and silent reading. Peabody Journal of Education, 1932, 9, 292-296.
- Karp, M. Silent before oral reading? Elementary School Journal, 1943, 44, 102-104.
- Kasdon, L. M. An examination of some assumptions related to the use of an individual reading test. Paper presented at the College Reading Association Meeting, Silver Springs, Md. November, 1973.
- _____. Oral versus silent-oral diagnosis. In D. L. De Boer (Ed.), Reading Diagnosis and Evaluation. Newark, Del.: International Reading Association, 1970.
- _____. Silent before oral reading Ohio Reading Teacher, 1967, 2, 6-9.
- Kirby, B. C. Silent-oral wins in test. Journal of Education, 1934, 117, 533-534.
- Morris, G. A. A comparison of fourth graders' oral and silent reading behavior in basal reader, science, and social studies materials. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1970.
- Myresko, M. Oral versus silent reading. New York State Education, 1966, 54, 49-52.
- Poulton, E. C. & Brown, C. H. Memory after reading aloud and reading silently. British Journal of Psychology, 1967, 58, 219-222.
- Rogers, M. V. Comprehension in oral and silent reading. Journal of General Psychology, 1937, 17, 394-397.

Rowell, E. H. The relationship between silent and oral reading comprehension in in grades three and five. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1973.

Sherman, R. H. Sequential aspects of silent and oral reading. Unpublished doctoral disseration, Yeshiva University, New York, 1977.

_____. Silent and oral reading instruction: controversy versus pseudo-controversy. Paper presented at the Canadian School Trustees Association, First Congress on Education, Toronto, Canada, June, 1978.

_____. Three types of oral reading. Unpublished manuscript.

_____. & Sherman, M. D. Transitions from oral to silent reading for meaning. Workshop presentation at the New York State Reading Association Meeting, Kiamesha Lake, N. Y. Fall 1976.

_____. Using media in developing oral reading fluency. Workshop presentation at the New York Reading Association Meeting, Fall 1977.

Spache, G. D. & Spache, E. B. Reading in the elementary school (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1973.

Swalm, J. R. A comparison of oral reading, silent reading, and listening. Education, 1972, 92, 111-115.

Waynant, L. F. An investigation of the relationship between techniques of testing and oral reading performance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1972.